

REMARKS

The present application was filed on May 31, 2001 with claims 1-34. Claims 1-34 remain pending.

In the outstanding Office Action dated October 20, 2005, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-25 and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199002 to Quimby (hereinafter "Quimby") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,934 to Delph (hereinafter "Delph"); and (ii) rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quimby in view Delph and U.S. Patent No. 6,516,340 to Boys (hereinafter "Boys").

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-25 and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quimby in view of Delph, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as specified in M.P.E.P. §2143.

As set forth therein, M.P.E.P. §2143 states that three requirements must be met to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited combination must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. While Applicants respectfully believe that none of the requirements have been met, it is sufficient to show that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by showing that one of the requirements has not been met.

The collective teaching of Quimby and Delph fails to suggest or render obvious at least the elements of independent claims 1, 11, 16, 23 and 30 of the present invention. For at least this reason, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent claim 1 recites a computer network for simultaneously sharing images and data in a presentation with individual scan and reset by a plurality of viewers/users. A server coupled via the network to a plurality of computers conducts the presentation. A selecting apparatus coupled to the network selects one of the computers as a leader user client computer. The remaining computers serve as audience user client computers. A transmitting apparatus coupled to the server transmits the presentation as a series of web pages from the server to the leader user client and audience user

client computers. Each web page of the series of web pages is transmitted individually upon receipt of a request at the server from the leader user client computer. One or more previously transmitted web pages of the series of web pages is transmitted to one or more audience user client computers in response to one or more audience user client computer requests received throughout the presentation. The individual transmission of the series of web pages prohibits the one or more audience user client computers from obtaining, via audience request, a web page for future display in the presentation. A displaying apparatus at the leader user client and audience user client computers displays each web page including a time line table identifying each web page displayed in the presentation. Independent claims 16 and 23 recite additional embodiments of the present invention having similar limitations.

Quimby discloses a method in which a developer creates a customized presentation, which a user is then able to view. The user also has the ability to modify the presentation through, for example, pausing, canceling, changing the sequence or changing the duration. Delph discloses a sender computer that interfaces with a server to receive data. Receiver computers monitor the sender in a synchronous mode. Sender computers are also capable of operating in an asynchronous mode by enacting a playback feature.

The combination of Quimby and Delph fails to disclose the transmission of one or more previously transmitted web pages to audience computers in response to audience requests received throughout the presentation. More specifically, Quimby describes a method in which a full presentation is loaded to a user computer. Therefore, Quimby fails to disclose individual transmission of previously transmitted web pages in response to a user request. Additionally, while Delph discloses a synchronous and an asynchronous mode, there is no disclosure that a transition between these modes takes place throughout the presentation. Thus, Delph provides no disclosure indicating that requests are received from receiver computers throughout the presentation for transmission of previously transmitted web pages.

The combination of Quimby and Delph also fails to disclose the display of a time line table identifying each web page displayed in the presentation. More specifically, although Quimby discloses a display screen that defines a current web site and provides means for navigating through

the presentation, the display screen fails to provide time line table or an identification of each web page displayed in the presentation. Delph fails to provide any disclosure that would remedy this deficiency in Quimby.


Independent claims 11 and 30 recite similar limitations to those of independent claim 1, with the exception of the displaying apparatus. Therefore, with regard to independent claims 11 and 30, the combination of Quimby and Delph fails to disclose the transmission of one or more previously transmitted web pages to audience computers in response to audience requests received throughout the presentation for the reasons presented above with regard to independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-22, 24, 25, 27-29 and 31-34 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 11, 16, 23 and 30, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-25 and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quimby in view of Delph and Boys, Applicants assert that dependent claim 26 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 23, and also recites patentable subject matter in its own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: January 19, 2006